

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appl. No. :	10/622,881	Conf. No. 2745
Applicant :	Sunil G. Warriar et al.	
Filed :	07/18/2003	
TC/A.U. :	1746	
Examiner :	Robert W. Hodge	
Docket No.:	02-510	
Cust. No. :	34704	

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Dear Sir:

This paper is submitted responsive to the Office Action mailed April 3, 2008. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

In the aforesaid action, the Examiner rejected independent claims 1 and 24 as unpatentable over newly-cited US publication 2003/0215689 to Keegan (hereafter Keegan) in view of US 6,139,810 to Gottzmann (hereafter Gottzmann).

The Examiner withdrew previous rejections based upon a combination of Cubukcu in view of Gottzmann to rely upon newly cited Keegan. Our review of Keegan shows that Keegan is clearly deficient in teaching the seal as called for by claims 1 and 24, and this is conceded by the Examiner. Rather, the Examiner relies upon Gottzmann as teaching this seal.

As previously pointed out, Gottzmann is both non-analogous art and, furthermore, teaches a radically different structure than that which is claimed. Gottzmann does not disclose a solid oxide fuel cell stack with at least two fuel cell components and a continuous fiber tow wrapped into a closed-loop structure forming a substantially gas impermeable seal between opposed surfaces of the components. Rather, in a completely different environment, Gottzmann discloses an o-

ring 50 which is between tube sheet 21, outer wall 54 of reaction tube 54, and a sleeve flange 58. None of these structures remotely resembles the structures which define the opposed surfaces as recited in claims 1 and 24. Further, none of these structures or teachings in Gottzmann related thereto would lead a person skilled in the art to believe that the o-ring 50 of Gottzmann could be substituted for the seal structure called for in Keegan. It is submitted that there is no proper motivation to select the o-ring from Gottzmann and insert it into the device of Keegan. This combination of prior art teachings is not logical, and would not be done by a person of skill in the art. It is therefore submitted that the present rejection based upon Keegan and Gottzmann is insufficient, and reconsideration is requested.

An earnest and thorough effort has been made to respond to the issues raised in the aforesaid office action. If upon considering this response, the Examiner is of the opinion that issues remain which could be addressed by telephone interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to discuss same.

It is believed that no fee is due in connection with this paper. If any such fee is due, please charge same to deposit account number 02-0184.

Respectfully submitted,
Sunil G. Warriar et al.

By /george a. coury/
George A. Coury
BACHMAN & LaPOINTE, P.C.
Reg. No. 34,309
Attorney for Applicants

Tel: (203)777-6628 ext. 113
Fax: (203)865-0297
docket@bachlap.com

Date: July 3, 2008